

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action dated January 11, 2006, claims 1, 5 and 7-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0229856 A1 ("Lynn et al."). In response, Applicant has canceled claims 1, 5 and 7-22, and has added new claims 23-42 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited reference.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the new independent claims 23 and 33 are not anticipated by Lynn et al., as explained below. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of the new independent claims 23 and 33, as well as the dependent claims 24-32 and 34-42.

A. Patentability of New Independent Claims 23 and 33

The cited reference of Lynn et al. does not disclose each element of the new independent claims 23 and 33. In particular, the cited reference of Lynn et al. does not disclose the limitations of "*drawing a diagonal line on said computer operating environment in response to user input to create said first grid, the dimensions of said first grid being determined by the height and width of said diagonal line,*" as recited in the new independent claims 23 and 33. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the new independent claims 23 and 33 are not anticipated by the cited reference of Lynn et al.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); MPEP §2131. As correctly stated in the Office Action, the cited reference of Lynn et al. does disclose that "when the user uses the mouse and clicks frame grid creation tool 126b for horizontal writing manuscript paper format in tool box 126, and then drags the mouse diagonally across the desired length on screen 121, the user can create a frame grid that has the same attributes and structure as layout grid 123 on layout grid 123." However,

the cited reference of Lynn et al. does not disclose *"drawing a diagonal line on said computer operating environment in response to user input to create said first grid, the dimensions of said first grid being determined by the height and width of said diagonal line,"* as recited in the new independent claims 23 and 33. That is, the cited reference of Lynn et al. does not disclose drawing *"a diagonal line,"* as recited in the new independent claims 23 and 33. Since each element of the new independent claims 23 and 33 is not disclosed in the cited reference of Lynn et al., these independent claims 23 and 33 are not anticipated by Lynn et al. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the new independent claims 23 and 33 be allowed.

C. Patentability of New Dependent Claims 24-32 and 34-42

Each of the new dependent claims 24-32 and 34-42 depends on one of the new independent claims 23 and 33. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

As an example, the new dependent claim 24 recites *"drawing another diagonal line on said computer operating environment in response to another user input to create a second grid" and "automatically snapping said first grid to said second grid when said first grid is released to create a customized composite grid on said computer operating environment."* The frame grids of Lynn et al. are not described as being able to snap to each other. Thus, the new dependent claim 24 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Lynn et al.

As another example, the new dependent claim 25 recites *"graphically changing at least one of said horizontal spacing and said vertical spacing of said first grid in response to a user command entered in at least one of said selections of said menu without closing said menu"* (emphasis added). The cited reference of Lynn et al. does

not disclose changing parameters of the layout grid without closing the menu 21. Thus, the new dependent claim 25 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Lynn et al.

As another example, the new dependent claim 26 recites "*automatically snapping said graphic object to said first grid using a particular align point of said graphic object, said particular align point being determined by said particular hot spot used to move said graphic object.*" The cited reference of Lynn et al. does not disclose using "*a particular align point*" of a graphic object that is determined by "*a particular hot spot*" of the graphic object, as recited in the dependent claim 26. Thus, the new dependent claim 26 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Lynn et al.

As another example, the new dependent claim 27 recites "*displaying a visual indicator of said particular align point of said graphic object only when said graphic object is moved over said first grid*" (emphasis added). The cited reference of Lynn et al. does not disclose such a limitation. Thus, the new dependent claim 27 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Lynn et al.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the claim amendments and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Denny Jaeger

Date: July 11, 2006

By:



Thomas H. Ham

Registration No. 43,654

Telephone: (925) 249-1300